

1
2 Supplement of
3 **Diurnal simulations on atmosphere-snow water vapor exchange and the**
4 **associated isotope effects at Dome Argus, Antarctica**
5
6

7 **Tianming Ma^{1,2}, Zhuang Jiang¹, Minghu Ding^{3,2}, Yuansheng Li⁴, Wenqian**
8 **Zhang³ and Lei Geng^{1, 2, 5}**

9 ¹ School of Earth and Space Sciences, University of Science and Technology of
10 China, Hefei 230026, China.

11 ² State Key Laboratory of Cryospheric Science, Northwest Institute of Eco-
12 Environment and Resources, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou 730000, China.

13 ³ Chinese Academy of Meteorological Sciences, Beijing 100081, China.

14 ⁴ Polar Research Institute of China, Shanghai 200136, China.

15 ⁵ CAS Center for Excellence in Comparative Planetology, University of Science and
16 Technology of China, Hefei 230026, Anhui, China.

17
18 *Correspondence to:* Lei Geng (genglei@ustc.edu.cn)

19
20
21
22
23 **Contents of this file**

24 Texts S1 to S2

25 Table S1
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

Table S1. List of variables in the model

Variables	Description (Unit)
E_x	Air-snow exchange flux ($\text{kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)
LE	Latent heat ($\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$)
ρ_v	Dry air density ($\text{kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$)
T_a	Air temperature at 4m height (K)
P_a	Atmospheric pressure (hPa)
L_s	Sublimation heat constant ($\text{J}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$), $L_s = 2.86\times 10^6 \text{ J}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$
z	Reference height in the boundary layer (m), $z = 4\text{m}$
r_a	Aerodynamic resistance from a reference height in the boundary layer to snow surface ($\text{s}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}$)
q_s	Saturated specific humidity over ice surface derived from the Clapeyron-Clausius equation ($\text{kg}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$)
RH _i	Calibrated relative humidity over ice surface (%)
q_a	Specific humidity over ice surface ($\text{kg}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$)
$dq_a/dt \times dT/dt$	Time derivatives of specific humidity and air temperature
C_E	Transfer coefficient for humidity
u_z	Wind speed ($\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)
k	von-karman constant, $k=0.40$
z_0	Surface roughness length for humidity exchange (m), $z_0=2.44\times 10^{-4}\text{m}$ at Dome A
Ψ_M	Diabatic corrections with respect to the ratio of the reference layer height
L	Monin-Obukhov length (m)
$\bar{\theta}$	Mean potential temperature between the surface and a reference height in the boundary layer (K)
θ	potential temperature at the snow surface (K)
θ_z	potential temperature at the reference height (K)
u^*	Friction velocity ($\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)
θ^*	Temperature turbulent scale (K)
g	Gravity acceleration ($\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$), $g=9.8 \text{ m/s}^2$
Ri	Richardson number
M_s	Snow mass (kg)
M_v	Water vapor mass (kg)
ρ_s	Snow density ($\text{kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$)
h_0	Snow height at initial time (m)
H_0	Near-surface boundary height at initial time (m)
R_s	Ratio between the abundance of heavy isotopes (^{18}O and D) and light isotopes (^{16}O and H) in the snow reservoir
R_v	Ratio between the abundance of heavy isotopes (^{18}O and D) and light isotopes (^{16}O and H) in the atmospheric water vapor reservoir
R_{Ex}	Ratio between the abundance of heavy isotopes (^{18}O and D) and light isotopes (^{16}O and H) in air-snow vapor exchange flux
δ	Another denotation of isotopic ratio (‰)
δS_0	Snow isotopic composition at initial time (‰)
δV_0	Water vapor isotopic composition at initial time (‰)
k'	Diffusion coefficient
α_f	Efficient fractionation coefficient
α_e	Equilibrium fractionation coefficient
α_k	Kinetic fractionation coefficient
D_i/D_i'	Ratio between the molecular diffusivity of major and minor water isotopic species in air
σ	Stefan-Boltzmann constant ($\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{K}^{-4}$), $\sigma = 5.67\times 10^{-8} \text{ W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{K}^{-4}$
ϵ	snow emissivity, $\epsilon = 0.93$
LW_{dn}	downward longwave radiative fluxes ($\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$)
LW_{up}	upward longwave radiative fluxes ($\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$)

42 Texts S1. Meteorological data processing

43 At Dome A, air temperature measured at all 3 heights exhibits a harmonic on the
44 diurnal scale. An interpolation method is thus presented to make a continuous record of
45 air temperature when observations are missed (e.g., Laepple et al., 2018). The formula
46 used is as follows:

$$47 T_a = T_{\text{mean}} + A1 \cos(\omega t + \Phi) + A2 \sin(\omega t + \Phi) \quad (\text{S1})$$

48 where T_{mean} denotes the daily mean from temperature observations, $A1$ and $A2$ are
49 the amplitude of the harmonics, ω and t is the angular frequency and time, Φ denotes
50 the phase of first harmonics.

51 The observed relative humidity (RH_w) at height z are normalized to the saturation
52 vapor pressure at the surface temperature. Then they requires previously calibration
53 when it acts as the super-saturation coefficient for calculating the kinetic fractionation
54 factor in the model (Eq.15). However, the common correction method developed by
55 Anderson (1994) fails to capture the super-saturation conditions at temperature $< -20^\circ\text{C}$
56 when the AWS probe is affected by frost deposition (Makkonen, 1996; 2005). To solve
57 the issue, we proposed an improvement method, based on the calibration procedures of
58 Anderson (1994), to rescale RH at Dome A. The details are follows: 1) RH_w
59 observations were converted to RH_I^0 using Eq. S2, 2) The RH_I^0 were calibrated using
60 the ideal maximum RH_I at each air temperature point ($RH_I^1 = RH_I^0 / RH_I^{\text{max}}$). Note the
61 RH_I^{max} was set to the 95th percentile of RH_I^0 at each air temperature point, 3) For
62 $RH_I^1 > 100\%$ (i.e., super-saturation condition), RH_I^1 was multiplied by a factor to
63 calculate RH as the final result. This factor was the ratio of saturation vapor pressure
64 over ice at the ambient air temperature. The rising amplitude of the temperature was
65 depended on comparisons of atmospheric moisture measurements between AWS and
66 frost-point hygrometer at Dome C (Genthon et al., 2017).

$$67 RH_i = (q_s^w / q_s^i) * RH_w \quad (\text{S2})$$

69 Texts S2. Uncertainty analysis

70 At each time step, we firstly calculated the uncertainties of wind speed (Q_U), air
71 temperature (Q_{T4m}), relative humidity (Q_{RH}) using the hourly AWS observations of
72 those selected days for each parameter. The same method was also used to estimate the
73 variability in surface temperature calculations (Q_{Ts}). Then the variations of the error of
74 friction velocity (Q_{u^*}), aerodynamic resistance (Q_{ra}), latent heat (Q_{LE}) and specific
75 humidity (Q_q) were estimated through the error propagation method for a multi-variable
76 function (e.g., Radic et al., 2017). The uncertainties for those meteorological parameters
77 can thus be propagated into the final error for u^* , r_a , LE and q .

78 Based on uncertainty analysis of u^* , r_a and q , we used a Monte Carlo approach
79 to quantify uncertainties in the modeled vapor exchange flux (E_x). This approach is
80 model running 1000 times with randomly perturbed values of u^* , r_a and q . For each
81 Monte Carlo run, we picked the values of perturbed parameters assuming a normal
82 distribution of mean values and standard deviations. Then the errors of E_x can be
83 presented by a standard deviation of 1000 ensemble runs and labeled as Q_{ra}' , Q_{u^*}' and
84 Q_q' . Finally, the total error of E_x was assessed as the root mean sum of these three
85 individual estimations. The MATLAB code of uncertainty propagation functions are
86 sourced from [https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/89812-](https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/89812-uncertainty-propagation-functions)
87 [uncertainty-propagation-functions](https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/89812-uncertainty-propagation-functions) (Joe Klebba, 2022).

88 The same Monte Carlo method were also used to quantify the uncertainties (Q_δ)

89 in isotopic values, but with uncertainties of E_x and effective fractionation coefficient
90 (α_f). Note that the uncertainties of effective fractionation coefficient (α_f) were estimated
91 using error propagation method and observed temperature data.
92

93 Reference

94 Anderson, P. S.: A Method for Rescaling Humidity Sensors at Temperatures Well below
95 Freezing, *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 11(5), 1388-1391, doi:
96 10.1175/1520-0426(1994)011<1388:AMFRHS>2.0.CO;2, 1994.

97 Genthon, C., Piard, L., Vignon, E., Madeleine, J.-B., Casado, M., & Gallée, H.:
98 Atmospheric moisture supersaturation in the near-surface atmosphere at Dome C,
99 Antarctic Plateau, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17(1), 691-704, doi:
100 10.5194/acp-17-691-2017, 2017.

101 Hughes, A. G., Wahl, S., Jones, T. R., Zuhr, A., Hörhold, M., White, J. W. C., Steen-
102 Larsen, H. C.: The role of sublimation as a driver of climate signals in the water
103 isotope content of surface snow Laboratory and field experimental results, *The*
104 *Cryosphere*, 15(10), 4949-4974, doi: 10.5194/tc-15-4949-2021.

105 Makkonen, L.: Comments on “A Method for Rescaling Humidity Sensors at
106 Temperatures Well below Freezing, *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic*
107 *Technology*, 13(4), 911–912, doi: 10.1175/1520-
108 0426(1996)013<0911:COMFRH>2.0.CO;2, 1996.

109 Makkonen, L., & Laakso, T.: Humidity Measurements in Cold and Humid
110 Environments, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 116(1), 131-147, doi:
111 10.1007/s10546-004-7955-y, 2005.

112 Ma, Y., Bian, L., Xiao, C., Allison, I., & Zhou, X.: Near surface climate of the traverse
113 route from Zhongshan Station to Dome A, East Antarctica, *Antarctic Science*,
114 22(4), 443-459, doi: 10.1017/s0954102010000209, 2010.

115 Laepple, T., Münch, T., Casado, M., Hoerhold, M., Landais, A., & Kipfstuhl, S.: On the
116 similarity and apparent cycles of isotopic variations in East Antarctic snow pits,
117 *The Cryosphere*, 12(1), 169-187. doi: 10.5194/tc-12-169-2018, 2018.

118 Pang, H., Hou, S., Landais, A., Masson-Delmotte, V., Jouzel, J., Steen-Larsen, H. C., et
119 al.: Influence of Summer Sublimation on δD , $\delta^{18}O$, and $\delta^{17}O$ in Precipitation,
120 East Antarctica, and Implications for Climate Reconstruction From Ice Cores,
121 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 124(13), 7339-7358, doi:
122 10.1029/2018JD030218, 2019.

123 Radić, V., Menounos, B., Shea, J., Fitzpatrick, N., Tessema, M. A., & Déry, S. J.:
124 Evaluation of different methods to model near-surface turbulent fluxes for a
125 mountain glacier in the Cariboo Mountains, BC, Canada, *The Cryosphere*, 11,
126 2897–2918, doi: 10.5194/tc-11-2897-2017, 2017.

127 Ritter, F., Steen-Larsen, H. C., Werner, M., Masson-Delmotte, V., Orsi, A., Behrens, M.,
128 et al.: Isotopic exchange on the diurnal scale between near-surface snow and lower
129 atmospheric water vapor at Kohnen station, East Antarctica, *The Cryosphere*,
130 10(4), 1647-1663, doi: 10.5194/tc-10-1647-2016, 2016.

131